



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF BIBLICAL PHILOLOGY

BY MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College

The present paper is intended as the forerunner of a larger work planned after the manner of Boeckh's "*Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaft*" and S. Reinach's "*Manuel de philologie classique*". What has been done so successfully and on so comprehensive a scale for classical philology, has to the knowledge of the writer not been attempted for the wide field of biblical philology; and while a work of this character constitutes a pressing need to instructor and student alike, a shorter sketch, though it must necessarily fall short of the ideal requirements, will at least indicate the nature of the want. It has not been deemed advisable to encumber this tentative effort with anything like an exhaustive bibliographical apparatus which must be reserved for the larger work; in the main the footnotes serve the purpose of relieving the body of the text from unwieldy parentheses. The choice of one concrete example for the illustration of the various philological operations to which the Scriptures may be subjected will no doubt commend itself to the judicious reader; if the name of one modern commentator occurs in this connection quite frequently, it is because he is rightly considered the representative of a certain class of exegetes.

I. In English, three distinct sciences appear to be

thrown together under the one name "philology": (*a*) the (general) science of language, also called linguistic science, or linguistics, and sometimes designated, since it must have a Greek name, as glottology³,—a science which has for its object a study of the origin and development of language in general, dealing, whether in a philosophical or historical manner, not so much with this or that particular language, but with all languages, exemplifying amidst the variety of types the universal laws governing articulate speech as a vehicle of thought, the phonetic decay of words, their semantic development, etc.; (*b*) the comparative grammar⁴ of a group of cognate languages, illustrating the dialectal variations of a real or supposed parent language as they develop into separate languages, and pointing out their common laws of structure; such, of course, is the subject only of "comparative" philology; accordingly, "philology" minus the qualifying adjective is identified with the grammatical and lexicographical study of a language, and in the popular mind the philologist is solely and simply a grammarian or dictionary writer; (*c*) philology proper, which has been defined by its master-builders as nothing short of that science which has for its aim the knowledge of human thought as far as it has been expressed⁵.

2. Now the modes of expressing thought are diverse: it may be by means of a statue or painting or structure,—thought carved in stone, or painted on canvass, or embodied in a cathedral,—or by means of gesture, the mimicry of language⁶, or finally by means of articulate speech, the word spoken (or written). Psychology and logic are equally

**Relation of
Philology to
Cognate
Sciences**

concerned with human thought, but their province is the *formal* side of thought, the laws governing the origin or possibility or sequences of thought. Philology deals with the *matter* of thought: back of the word it would divine the thought, recover it in its original lucidity and make it throb again with the warmth that suffused it when it was first ushered into the world. Philology's twin sister is History: according to some⁷ the two are identical; others conceive of philology as the handmaiden of history, both covering the same range of subjects, except that the method which is always apparent in the philological operation remains latent in the historical presentation⁸. Over against those sciences whose scope consists in discovering universal laws under which particular phenomena may be subsumed, the historico-philological sciences are pre-eminently concerned with the particular, with Personality, whether it be that of an individual or that of a collective aggregate of humanity⁹.

3. Philology is a science to be sure, but also an art (τέχνη); and philological instruction means largely the teaching of a sum of technical devices¹⁰.

The student must be taught early to sur- **Philology also**
vey his field and possess himself of the **an Art**
tools. For if philology aims at reproducing
thought, the actual matter of thought that passed through
a human brain and thrilled a human soul, interpretation be-
comes the chief philological operation; and if interpreta-
tion is to lead to understanding as lucid and immediate as
when a man speaks to us face to face, it must be mediated
by as complete an array of data as we can gather, con-
fronted as we often are by a foreign idiom or by a literary

document composed in by-gone days. Mediated understanding—that is what philological interpretation amounts to¹¹. While immediate understanding is in itself a complex process, yet made simple and instantaneous through long practice, the mediated philological understanding is necessarily a still more laborious one requiring long study and stedfast perseverance; in the end, it is true, the expert gains a certain tact which sometimes works immediately and as it were by divination.

4. The business of the philologist thus seems to be the faithful, lifelike, portraiture of thought in all its individual content and coloring. There was a constellation of events that was unique; and in that unique constellation there lived a unique man; and that man gave utterance to a unique thought which the philologist would recover from beneath the rubbish of the past. But there is also a constructive side to philology. The philologist, if possessed of an imitative faculty that is perfect, will see with the author's eyes and re-think his thoughts, be he epic bard or dramatist or prophet or psalmist; but he can do more: he can bring to bear upon the single utterance or a piece of literature all the known facts backward and forward that stand in relation thereto and view it synthetically. It has been said that the philologist understands the orator and poet better than they understood themselves or were understood by their contemporaries; for what to them was immediate and matter-of-fact, is turned by the philologist into *conscious cognition*¹².

5. Since human culture which is the object of philolo-

gical investigation is national in character, and since of all the corporate cultural achievements of a nation it is in language that the national genius primarily manifests itself, it follows that the divisions of philology must follow the boundaries of linguistic areas. There will naturally be found on the philological chart vast territories, like the Indo-European or Semitic, and smaller domains like the Greek or Hebrew. Whatever may be the heritage which the Hebrews received from their Semitic forefathers, the individuality of the sons of Eber stands off clearly by itself over against the sum total of culture possessed by all the children of Shem alike. But even in the culture of Israel, or of the Jewish people, which can justly be made the subject of encyclopædic treatment, the Biblical literature may be properly placed apart and given over to a specific department of study. The justification of a Biblical philology is not merely to be found in the vastness of the philological labor that is requisite for the interpretation of the thought deposited therein, but rather in the unique character of the Scriptures of which the formation of the canon by the Jews themselves was the first conscious appreciation. In the following pages a survey of the scope of Biblical philology is attempted.

Biblical Philology as a Separate Department of Study justified by the Formation of the Canon

6. First in order naturally comes the *interpretatio verborum*, פִּרְשׁ הַמּוֹט, It is rooted in grammar and lexicon. A concrete example may help define both. Job 3, 3 reads: 'יֵאָבֵד יוֹם אֲוִלָּר בּוֹ' וְהַלִּילָה אֶמֶר הָרָה נָבֵר. Our first business is reading (de-

*Interpretatio
verborum:*
Grammatical

cipherment, pronunciation). We recognize a number of symbols (letters,¹³ אותיות). They are naturally treated at the very threshold of grammar: the script, more specifically the square script (כתיבה מרבעת) which we learn to understand as the Aramaic development of the older Hebrew¹⁴ (עברי) with the ligatures broken through¹⁵. We learn about the traditional order of the alphabet¹⁶ and the names of the letters¹⁷. Their consonantal function we likewise learn from tradition; their grouping according to the organs of speech is equally old.¹⁸ That belongs already to that division of grammar which treats of sounds (phonetics). Next we observe the points¹⁹ (נקודות). As symbols they are treated again in the chapter concerning the script where we learn their traditional names and their history²⁰, also the fact that the manuscripts present another system of notation²¹. In the phonology we are made acquainted with the vowels of which they are symbols; we also find that the parallel system has a bearing upon pronunciation.²² The point which we find (three times) within a letter is treated again under script as well as under phonetics²³. A third set of symbols²⁴ indicating the accents²⁵ (טעמים) is equally elucidated under script and phonetics²⁶, though their exact function can be mastered only at the end of the grammar²⁷. In the script we shall also find the vowel-letters²⁸ ו, י discussed; and in the phonology the absorption²⁹ of the א in יאבד will be accounted for. In the phonetic part of the grammar we shall also learn to distinguish the first — as originating in a primitive³⁰ *a*, the second as the resultant of a contracted diphthong *aw*, the third as due to a similar contraction over the slurred laryngal *h* which was really the all-important

element of the pronominal suffix; the grammatical determination of the fourth is bound up with a lexicographical (exegetical) question which will come up subsequently. Similarly we shall learn in the same part of grammar to treat separately the first and the third, the second, the fourth, and the fifth ־ ; in the same manner to hold apart the first and last ־ . All these distinctions will be found to be an aid to sense. The inseparable prefixes ב and ו are again a subject for the chapter concerning the script²¹. On the other hand, we shall expect to find elucidated in the phonology the recession of the accent with which we meet three times in our verse.

7. The first two parts of grammar have taught us to read (pronounce accurately). We read of course according to tradition, the living tradition which is multifarious; but sporadic allusions in early **Traditional** grammatical literature²² bring us nearer to **Pronunciation** the pronunciation current in the schools of the authors of the punctuation (נקדים). Latin and Greek transliterations²³ on the whole substantiate tradition, though pointing to a less fixed pronunciation which here and there is more archaic. A traditional chanting exists also which is equally diverse²⁴.

8. We proceed now to the Word which is a combination of sounds expressive of sense. The third part of grammar, the morphology, disengages the stem from its formative accretions and classifies forms according to their inner inflection (**Morphology** characteristic of the Semitic languages). Formative elements, forms, and words are also classified according to their function in the sentence (in a preliminary way at least). Thus **אֲבִיר** is determined as **אֲבִיר** + **י**, the **י** indicat-

ing the third person singular masculine of the pre-form³⁵ and the remainder being the simple stem of the root אָבַר ; similarly אָוֹלַד as אָ + נ + וֹלַד , the אָ indicating the first person singular of the pre-form, the נ³⁶ a formative stem-accretion belonging to the N-stem, and what follows being the root אָוֹלַד³⁷. יוֹם and נֶבֶר³⁸ are placed under one type (משקל)³⁹. The identification of types, in our present knowledge (or ignorance) of Hebrew (Semitic) grammar, here and there leads to a hint concerning the function (category) of the noun⁴⁰, but just as often leaves us in the dark⁴¹. And so on.

9. Morphology helps us in the main to consult the lexicon for the meaning of the root. The lexicon contains

more than that. For, although the stem-differentiation along with modal distinctions is dealt with in the grammar⁴², there are manifold *nuances* which the grammar is

powerless to reduce to law beyond the vaguest outline and which therefore are conscientiously noted in the lexicon.

We may lay our unfinished grammar aside for a moment, and turn to the lexicon. אָבַר means *perish*; יָלַד *bear*; יוֹם *day*; נֶבֶר *man*. We select in each case of course the most general meaning. What are the lexicographer's sources?

Tradition, primarily; supported or supplemented by the consonance of the traditional meaning with the context in the greatest number of places, by the ancient versions⁴³, by later Hebrew⁴⁴, by the cognate languages. In the case of rarer words⁴⁵ and especially of *hapax legomena* (מִלֵּי בִּדְרוּת) the rabbis already found themselves in perplexity⁴⁶ and very likely at an earlier date the ancient versions⁴⁷; Saadya helped himself by reference to later Hebrew, others like himself either tacitly or avowedly compared Aramaic⁴⁸ or Arabic⁴⁹; a process repeated on a larger scale since the days of

Schultens and Ludolf, with Ethiopic, Assyrian, Phœnician, Southern Arabic to swell the apparatus; and in the case of words apparently borrowed or foreign we consult Sanskrit and Iranian and Armenian and Egyptian, and possibly even Greek⁸⁰. The meaning of rare words, particularly when other means fail, must be determined from the context (לפי ענינו, לפי מקומו); but the context cannot give certainty or absolute definiteness; it often represents a circle which to be sure shuts out all sorts of possible meanings, but within which there is still ample variety to choose from. The honest lexicographer will add a sign of query to many a meaning thus ascertained, or, with Rashi, admit his ignorance (לא ידעתי).

10. The Word has thus far been treated in isolation, but human speech does not consist of detached words. The Sentence is the unit of speech. Within the sentence each word has its function and **Syntax. Functional Part** more or less its fixed position. Function goes in the developed state of the language with form⁸¹; and conversely formative elements with functional force are lost through phonetic decay⁸². The theory of functions within the sentence as a unit belongs to the first part of syntax⁸³, where also the various kinds of sentences are described⁸⁴. Thus יאבר יום is a verbal clause, an optative sentence; יום is subject, יאבר is predicate. *Perish the day!* The next sentence may at first be treated without reference to the preceding clause, in artificial isolation. What is the function of the pre-form⁸⁵? The parallel passage, Jerem 20, 14 has: יִלְדָּתִי בּוֹ. The English Version renders both passages alike: *I was born*. Is it beyond the power of the English language to express the particular *nuance* which belongs to ילדתי over against אולד?

or are the two really identical? According to Kautzsch we ought to render: *I was to be born*. He compares II Kings 3, 27: *his eldest son אשר ימלך that was to reign*. On the other hand, Ewald and Driver interpret: *nascendus eram, I was being born*, the event being represented as nascent, and so, the speaker "seizing upon it while in movement rather than while at rest, pictured with peculiar vividness to the mental eye"; the usage is said to be peculiar of the language of poetry, though traces of it are found also in prose.⁵⁶ But there is another view quite as plausible: אולר, to speak the language of Greek grammar, is aorist minus augment.⁵⁷ As in Greek, such forms are archaic, hence confined to poetry. And it is part of the interpreter's business to distinguish between prose and poetry.

11. The concluding part of grammar is the syntax proper which deals with co-ordination and subordination of sentences. The first half of our verse consists of two sentences combined in a syntactical relation. In the prose parallel אשר intervenes to indicate the relation. In Arabic, the omission of the corresponding relative is conditioned by the indeterminateness of the antecedent. In Hebrew no such conditions seem to have been considered requisite.⁵⁸ But the omission of אשר is peculiar of poetry. יום is in the construct state.⁵⁹

12. In the present instance, the verbal interpretation is almost tantamount to the contextual interpretation, פורש. The context being rhetorical and poetic, the interpreter must add stylistic observations. Thus the *parallelismus membrorum* obtrudes itself immediately upon his attention. What is the subject of אִמֶּר? AV.: *and the*

night in which it was said; hence האמר is subject.⁶⁰ RV., on the other hand, takes הלילה as subject: *and the night which said*. Either is grammatically correct; according to the former interpretation supply: בו.⁶¹ When we consult tradition, we find that AV. has the support of the Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, Saadya, Ibn Janah, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Ralbag; on the side of RV. we find among the ancients the Targum with its paraphrase: *and the angel that is set over conception at night, who said*. The source of the Targumic paraphrase is the rabbinic saying: *the angel that is set over conception, Lailah (= Night) is his name*.⁶² This is apparently haggadic; but פ' proves that the rabbis took הלילה as subject; the introduction of the angel sets aside the poetic personification of an inanimate object which to them was an objectionable feature. That such scruples existed, can be proved from numerous passages in the Targum.⁶³ But an important observation is here in place. Back of the haggadic there always lies a certain conception of the simple, unsophisticated, sense, which conception may be erroneous or true, but it constitutes the rabbinic interpretation which it is our duty to record. The discovery of the פשט behind the מדרש, be the latter מדרש הגדה or מדרש הלכה, would furnish ample material for a monograph.⁶⁴ In the present passage, the rabbinic interpretation coincides with that of RV. and of most moderns, Fried. Delitzsch alone, so far as I can see, going with AV. Budde even adds that the night is conceived by the poet as "*geheimnisvolles Geisterwesen*", a mysterious ghostly being;

this certainly comes close to the rabbis! A few remarks on the subject of traditional exegesis will also be in place. That the (lexical) meaning of words is based mainly on tradition has been mentioned above. But what I have in mind now is contextual interpretation. The meanings of **לילה** and **אמר** by themselves were indeed fixed by tradition. But the meaning of the clause **אמר והלילה** may and may not have been a matter of tradition. We cannot say with certainty whether a given rabbinic interpretation, even when it is reported anonymously, was the commonly accepted one at that time. Place, time, and the idiosyncrasies of individual minds must have occasioned differences. Saadya, in the present case and elsewhere, apparently does not consider himself bound by rabbinic interpretation. There is no unanimity among the ancient versions or among the mediæval Jewish commentators. Here and there we find **כך מצאתי** or **כך שמעתי** hinting at some sort of tradition; but when traced to its source, it may have represented but an individual's reasoning unsupported by further tradition. In Rashi's days, discoveries were being made daily in the simple sense⁶⁵; and the motto apparently was, *Dies diem docet*. It was known that the true sense must be simple, but that the simple sense was not necessarily the common; that the **פשט** must not be labored, but that it is not gotten without labor; that the simple sense was as deep (**עומק הפשט**) as the homiletical, but that, when discovered, it seemed obvious. Of course, the interpretation of authoritative minds tends to become traditional; but then it is not a question of what it came to be, but what it was originally. For if originally based on reasoning, it must pass once more before the bar of reason. Moreover, reason itself represents

a growth; and what is reasonable at one time, may not be so at other times, and *vice versa*; a rational interpretation is one thing, and a rationalistic quite another. It would be a meritorious piece of work to determine with accuracy the degree of unanimity among Bible commentators of repute, ancient and modern. For, though Biblical exegesis has been the playground of genius and mediocrity, and individual guesses have been well nigh countless, nevertheless in the exegetical struggle for existence there has been at work natural selection, the fittest interpretation surviving, while the ephemeral was consigned to well-merited oblivion. It is for the purpose of illustrating my point that I resurrect here the following gem of absurdity perpetrated by the Biurist Landau: "*die Nacht, die dem Mann verkündete: Sie hat empfangen*" (the night, which brought tidings to the husband, She hath conceived).⁶⁶

**Exegetical
Unanimity**

13. הָרָה נָפַר , of course, is not easy. As for the verb, it would seem on the basis of the parallelistic construction of the two halves of the verse, that it might be determined by the equation הָרָה = x : *was born*. The nearest parallel is Cant. 3, 4: עַר שֶׁהֵבִיאָתִי אֶל בֵּית אִמִּי וְאֶל חֵדֶר הוֹרָתִי, with which compare further *ibid.* 6, 9: אַחַת הִיא לְאִמָּה בְּרָה הִיא לְיֹלְדָתָהּ; hence הוֹרָה (participle) is a synonym of יוֹלְדָה (אֵם). Synonymity, of course, need not be identity. The common element is merely: *motherhood*. יוֹלְדָתִי is *my mother as she that bare me*. That הָרָה indicates a stage anterior to יוֹלְדָה, is shown by the frequently recurring phrase וְתָהָר וְתִלְדַּךְ, then by a passage like הָרִינוּ חֲלָנוּ כְּמוֹ יֹלְדֵנוּ רוּחַ Isa. 26, 18, where, though the whole is said figuratively of anxious and disappointed

**Exegetical
Difficulties**

waiting, the three verbs denote the three stages: conception, the approach of parturition, and parturition itself; compare also Hosea 9, 11 a climax of calamities: *there shall be no birth* (לָרָה), *and none with child* (בֶּטֶן), *and no conception* (הָרִיין). Leaving on the side I Chron. 4, 17, we find הָרָה with an object in the metaphorical sense of planning evil, etc., but also in the physical sense, as in Moses' question: הָאֲנֹכִי הָרִיתִי אֶת כָּל הָעָם הַזֶּה אִם אֲנֹכִי יִלְדֵיהֶם Num. 11, 12. Accordingly הָרָה נָבֵר, in agreement with Symmachus, Vulgate, Syriac, Targum, means: *conceptus est homo, there is conceived a man*. We are then to interpret the first half of the verse as referring to the day of birth, and the second as treating of the night of conception. Saadya, Ibn Ezra, and Fried. Delitzsch simplify the matter by taking the two synonyms, הָרָה and יָלַד, as identical; Saadya and Ibn Ezra support their rendering by adducing I Chron. 4, 17,—a methodological error, *obscurum per obscurius*,—and Fried. Delitzsch refers to Cant. 3, 4,—but even there the parallelism need not be one of identity, for הוֹרִיתִי means: *she that conceived me*, hence: *my mother*. Duhm argues strenuously against the supposition that the poet alludes to two different occasions, on æsthetic grounds⁸⁷. Aesthetic judgments are necessarily of a subjective character; in this particular instance the æsthetic argument is contradicted by verse 10, where the reference to conception is unmistakable. A second difficulty is felt by many commentators with regard to נָבֵר, which, they say, means: *vir adultus*, the grown man. Hence it is that Rashi took הָרָה in a causative sense: *A man hath caused to conceive*⁸⁸. It is not easy to defend this view grammatically. As a causative, הָרָה could only come from the root יָרָה, and, at least in its ordinary sense: *point out, direct, teach*, it is unsuitable. Yet,

a defense could be bolstered up, and the meaning *fructify* vindicated for ירה⁶⁹. Accordingly the — would have originated in *aw*, whereas, according to the current interpretation, it is the equivalent of *u*⁷⁰.

14. Some moderns resort to emendation. Here we are introduced to another philological operation: textual criticism (the lower criticism). Criticism is an offshoot of the *interpretatio*. It means, when our exegetical skill is taxed to the utmost and we are (actually or seemingly) confronted by non-sense⁷¹, a regress from the present form of the text to an earlier, better, the original perchance, from tradition vitiated to tradition restored. For the stretch of time intervening between the original⁷² and the earliest manuscript extant is a long one; alterations ensue, some intentional⁷³, others of an irrational character⁷⁴. Parallel texts⁷⁵ and the versions prove at least the existence of variants. The marginal readings of the received text represent emendations; but often just parallel readings, which were mistaken in aftertimes for corrections. A treatise on the קריין is still to be written. Another monograph should be devoted to (1) the אל תקרי ; (2) ממעין, סבירין ; (3) conjectural emendations in the guise of grammatical or rhetorical rules⁷⁶ in the works of the mediæval Jewish exegetes, notably Ibn Janah and Tanhum. Here is also the place for a proper definition of the Masoretic Text. It is apparently nothing more than the text found in manuscripts and early prints substantiated by that system of annotations which we call Masorah⁷⁷. It is true, the Synagogue has its *textus receptus* which is sufficient for practical purposes. So it has its *textus receptus* of the Tal-

Textual Criticism an Offshoot of the Interpretatio

Definition of the Masoretic Text

mud. But the real text of the Talmud is at present buried in manuscripts, and indirectly in quotations⁷⁹; and the farther we ascend⁸⁰, the more the text is found to diverge, the greater the number of variants. For in the history of every text there is such a thing as a leveling process; the more a book is read, the more it will tend to uniformity.⁸¹ The genuine text of the Talmud, as far as we can get at it, despite some good preliminary work that has been done,⁸² awaits reconstruction; and the reconstruction of a text is a philological operation which has its rules that must be mastered⁸³. Equally the reconstruction of the Biblical text, not yet the original, but the Masoretic form thereof⁸⁴, awaits consummation at the hands of a master trained in the school of philology. And much even will remain doubtful. For, in the first place, the Masoretic system of annotations, gigantic though it be, is necessarily incomplete, and we fall back upon the manuscripts themselves which are not uniform. Then examples abound of divergent masorahs (*מסורות מתחלפות*).⁸⁵ The Talmud has been found to be at variance with *our* Masorah. The masoretic vigilance certainly antedates the written Masorah; we must therefore seek to attain to the oral Masorah. In the case of conflicts, Norzi considers the Targum as an arbiter. We know today that the Targum is based on the Oriental (*מדינהא*) recension of the text; we further know, what Norzi did not know, that the Targum of Proverbs is bodily (with slight changes) taken over from the Syriac Version, which frequently incorporates Septuagintal readings. Norzi, on one occasion, even quotes a reading from the Seventy; he significantly adds that we must not deviate from the tradition of our fathers (*ואנו אין לנו לזוז ממסרת שמסרו לנו אבותינו*).⁸⁶ That is on the whole a safe principle for reasons which will become apparent later. But we know that the Masoretic

text is in the main presupposed by Vulgate, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, some further anonymous Greek versions, and the Hexaplaric texts of the Septuagint. The artificial boundary-line between masoretic and pre-masoretic, at least for strictly scientific purposes, thus falls to the ground. It will be the business of the future editor of the Masoretic text to adduce all the corroboration of the reconstructed text wheresoever he will find it, be it manuscript evidence, or a masoretic note, or a quotation from a lost codex, or the Targum, or Aquila, or a Hexaplar manuscript. He will naturally also be in duty bound to register variants, be it from the margin, or from the Talmud, or from the Targum, or from the Greek evidence. Many will be the difficulties that must beset his path, and many the problems raised. But scientific work is never finished; and the sum of knowledge often represents but a bundle of questions. When he comes to use the evidence of the versions, be it the Targum only, he will be confronted by such texts as are themselves in need of philological reconstruction; and even with a clean text before him, he will at every step face the query: Variant or paraphrase? The problems of retroversion become manifold, when the evidence of the oldest version, the Septuagint, is approached". The supreme test is again the ability to distinguish between actual variant (in the "*Vorlage*") and free translation. Freedom may be due to general motives (religious scruples and the like) or to individual idiosyncracies. Also the degree of freedom need not be the same: contrast the Pentateuch with Proverbs or Job. But before we are confronted by the dilemma: Freedom or variant, we must be sure of our Greek text which simply teems with variants.

How the Masoretic Text is to be reconstructed

The Use of the Versions

Holmes-Parsons and now the larger Cambridge edition contain but the readings; these await judicious sifting. For some are utterly worthless and eliminable as inner-Greek corruptions or wilful (Christian for instance) alterations; others represent parallel renderings of the same Hebrew word or phrase. The Septuagint student must consult not only manuscripts (uncial, cursive) and early prints (Complutensian, Aldine, Sixtine), but also the daughter-versions (Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Sahidic, Bohairic, Armenian) and quotations (church-fathers, New Testament, Josephus, Philo). The apparatus is a complex one; to ignore it is to forego the claim to scientific accuracy.

15. A good example is afforded by the passage in Job. For הָרָה זָכָר the Septuagint has: Ἰδοὺ ἄρσεν, *Lo, a male!*

**An Example
afforded by
the Present
Passage**

The omission of ἰδοὺ in one manuscript need not detain us. Nor need the Sahidic paraphrase: *It is a male child*⁸⁸ cause comment. The Bohairic and Syriac literally reproduce the Greek. The Latin (based on the Hexapla) has: *Conceptus est homo*, which means simply a reversion on the part of Origen to the "*Hebraica veritas*", substantiating at least the Hebrew text for those "pre-masoretic" days. It is tolerably certain, however, that the Greek translator wrote: Ἰδοὺ ἄρσεν, *Lo, a male!* What did he read in his Hebrew text? Duhm answers: הָרָה זָכָר, which of course does away with all the difficulties, real or supposed⁸⁹, at a bound. He adds: "Unser הָרָה könnte von einem Abschreiber herrühren, der versehentlich das nachbiblische הָרָה, siehe, für הָרָה schrieb." This bit of wisdom comes from Geiger who, however, ascribes this confusion to the translator who had a scruple to translate delicate matters literally. Geiger is really

guilty of a contradiction; for if the translator had that scruple, the adventitious aid of a misread (mispointed) הרה becomes unnecessary. As for Duhm's identification of ἄρσεν with זָכָר, he is of course thinking of the graphic similarity of ב and ז. But Gen. 7, 2 (twice) אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ is rendered ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ; so do our English versions render: *the male and his female*; yet, I am sure, no one will pretend that the Greek translator (let alone the English) read. זָכָר וְנָקְבָּה. The translator simply ignored a bit of Pentateuchal criticism and with the least of concern assimilated a J to a P phrase! Similarly ἄρσεν is employed for זָכָר and יָלָד⁹⁰. All that ἄρσεν need point to, is a masculine noun, denoting a human being whether grown or in childhood. Thus זָכָר might be rendered ἄρσεν with impunity; and there is no warrant that something else was read. As for הרה, the translator may perchance have been misled by the late Hebrew הָרָה. There was, however, a psychological motive for his error: not so much the scruple about translating delicate matters literally, but because his literary taste (which he shared with Duhm) shrank from ascribing to the poet a double reference to the day of birth and to the night of conception. Job curses the νυχθήμερον of his birth; *voilà tout*. That the translator was quite capable of mispointing his text shall not be gainsaid. To mention one example among many: חֲלֻמוֹת dreams for חֲלֻמוֹת ox-tongue 6, 6! Nor is it to be denied that the translator found in his "Vorlage" many a variant; thus, for example, תִּנְיֵן will ye weary for תִּנְיֵן will ye vex 19, 2. Were I to edit the Masoretic text critically, I should print in the text הָרָה זָכָר and in the *argumentum* the following sources: א (ז', i. e. the form is a *hapax legomenon*) Heb. Σ(ἐξνήθη ἄνθρωπος)

𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 (ראתבטן נברא) 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 (*conceptus est homo*) 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 ;
 “was created” more decorous than “was conceived”) also
 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 (ιδού ἄρσεν freedom)²¹.

16. Back of Duhm's dual objection to the received text there really lurks a subtler motive which affords an example

The Higher Criticism of the influence of the *higher* criticism on textual (on interpretation). Duhm is convinced that the poet imitates Jerem. 20, 14-18.²² His pronouncement is of course based

on highly subjective grounds; but it furnishes a handle for determining the date of our poem. “The poet, in 3, 3 ff., is dependent upon Jerem. 20, 14 ff.”, thus runs the categorical statement in the Introduction. The poem was therefore composed some time after Jeremiah. This, of course, is a vague date; to render it more definite, further observations are requisite. Duhm supplies them. He is not quite sure that 12, 20-25 may not belong to an interpolator. But then repetitions are a peculiar feature of our poem. Be that as it may, verses 14-25 mirror the “Seelenzustand” of post-exilic Jewry. “All things are come to nought, nations and empires, the aristocracy and priesthood—such was the impression made on them by external history by virtue of the continued national catastrophes everywhere.” Hence, at the time when our poet wrote, the successive wars of Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians, as well as the downfall of the Jewish state, were a matter of the past. When the poet bitterly complains (9, 24): *When a land is given into the hand of a wicked man, He covereth the face of the rulers thereof*²³, Duhm sees therein an allusion to conditions such as prevailed in the Persian period. “If we were better acquainted with the history of the first centuries following the exile, we would be in a position to

fix the date of the author of the poem still more accurately." Duhm proceeds to find in Job, in the passages wherein the greatness of God is glorified, reminiscences from Deutero-Isaiah. As for the *terminus ad quem*, the points of contact between the poem and the Priests' Code go to show that the latter is dependent upon the former; thus the cosmological conceptions of the first chapter of Genesis are farther advanced than the corresponding notions in Job 38. Accordingly, the date of the poem is placed in the first half of the fifth century B. C. While thus the priority of the curse in Jeremiah is to Duhm (and others) an assured fact, certain critics look upon Job 3 as the original, some even going to the length of pronouncing Jerem. 20, 14-18 an interpolation on the basis of Job. Whatever be the answer, the query is certainly a justifiable one; of course, the two passages may be both dependent upon a common source, in which case the question would have no bearing whatsoever on the date of Job. An example has at any rate been afforded for the manner in which the date of a work may be ascertained under favorable conditions from internal evidence.

17. The *interpretatio verborum* is incomplete without the *interpretatio rerum*. Thus, in the present instance, the former simply reveals the fact that Job cursed the day of his birth and the night of his conception; the latter, however, deals with the ideas underlying the curse. Cursing is a species of magic; the curse is a "spell", and it operates mechanically. Instances from the Scriptures and from the rest of the "Semitic world" may be easily adduced. The subject is justly treated in manuals of biblical

The
Interpretatio
rerum

archæology. The aim of the science of archæology is to recover for us of a latter day a vision of the life of antiquity (specifically of a certain people of antiquity) both in its external forms and in its inward interests. With the adjunct sciences of geography and history, each on a comprehensive scale, it transcends the mere verbal interpretation by placing a literary production in its proper *milieu*, the latter constituting the total complex of conditions by which an author is surrounded and which must be known as fully as possible if the words he spoke and the thoughts he thought are to be adequately understood. We must know the soil he trod on, with its fields and meadows and forests, with its hills and valleys and streams and the sky above them; the country of which he was a citizen, with its constitution and government, its laws and institutions, its courts and parliaments; the nation whose son he was, with all its inherited habits of life and manners of thought, its traditions and beliefs and hopes; the political, social, and cultural atmosphere, which he shared in common with his people at that particular period,—if we wish truly to understand him. For words are abbreviated thoughts, and thought is but an element, become conscious, of the inner life with all its manifold stirrings; as we exchange communications with our fellow-men, we speak as it were in riddles, in hints and allusions, which are at once understood because the entire situation is mentally present to speaker and addressed alike, and the full intent and import are thus supplied above the verbal meaning of the utterance—from the context, the context of pulsating life. This context it is the business of the philologist to reconstruct in its entirety in order that the word snatched therefrom

may be organically co-ordinated with all its parts. Over against the atomistic interpretation of Scriptures, with the arithmetic mean of the total sum of fragments operating as a generic sacred logic, the contextual elucidation must be emphasized, which is indeed truly individual. A mere verbal exposition of a passage like Isaiah 22, 1-14 will at best mean a general and vague reference to *a* battle and *a* war (Rashi). Once we know, or imagine that we know, the exact situation admirably summed up in the concise heading: "Arraignment of the impenitent Jerusalemites during Sennacherib's siege of the capital" (Luzzatto), every word becomes significant, every phrase forceful, and the whole one vivid scene, with the prophet in the center thundering amidst the noisy carousals of his compatriots the message of "a day of trouble, and of trampling, and of perplexity".

**The Contextual
Interpretation
of Scriptures
versus the
Atomistic**

18. Individual as a situation always is, the word spoken therein is supremely so. Though we must know all the cultural forces that go to make an environment, of which naturally the person of the speaker or writer is a part, there must always remain a residuum which baffles analysis and which constitutes the core of human personality⁴. As philologists, we deal with the heroes of mankind, with Goethe and Shakespeare and Dante and Plato and Isaiah. It behooves us to remember that the genius, in employing the native speech of his people, enriches it constantly not only by new coinages, but in particular by endowing old words with new potencies and pouring new wine into old bottles. "*Le style est l'homme même.*" The grammar of the language spoken by Isaiah was forged in the dim past by some Bedouin ancestor; and it is but

**Individualistic
Interpretation**

proper that we ascend to the source and there discern the mechanism in all its parts. But it is equally important, and in the last analysis of the utmost importance, that we seek to ascertain the prophet's own grammar and lexicon, the particular *nuance* given by him to a word or phrase, the thought that underlies a favored expression.⁹⁵ The individual-psychological moment in philological interpretation plays as important a part at least as the grammatical, lexical, and contextual factors previously considered. Even the rabbis set off the verbose Ezekiel against the concise Isaiah;⁹⁶ and no two prophets, we are told, spoke in the same style (בסננן אחר)⁹⁷.

19. The simple sense with the elucidation of which the philologist is charged is often and rightly contrasted with the allegorical. Allegory is of course a legitimate form of rhetoric. The prophets frequently speak in משלים and חידות of which the solution (נמשל) is sometimes appended, but more often left to the imagination of the hearer or reader. When a writer veils his thoughts in allegorical form, the allegorical method of interpretation is naturally the only admissible one. But where we are reasonably certain that an allegorical meaning was farthest from the mind of the author, the allegorical interpretation may fitly interest the student of the history of exegesis; but for the purpose of understanding the writer it is clearly out of place. For, while the Zohar pronounces a woe upon him who says that there are in Scriptures secular stories and ordinary sayings⁹⁸, the Talmud gives expression to the opinion: "No Scriptural verse may be divested of its simple sense".⁹⁹ Well may the church-fathers point with ridicule to the "carnal"¹⁰⁰ exegesis of the Jews and their adherence

to the "bare letter";¹⁰¹ the rational, i. e., philological, interpretation of the Scriptures, which modern Christian commentators are fond of contrasting with the rabbinic whims and fancies, is rooted in the "mos Iudaicus"¹⁰², that habit of the Jewish mind which, though indulging in the by-ways of homily and mysticism, never lost sight of the one royal road to the understanding of Holy Writ, the sober, simple sense.

20. That verse in the third chapter of Job which has introduced us to so many and important philological operations, will reveal one more. We perceive that Job curses his day. How are we to reconcile that with the character "Job the patient" that we have met with in the preceding two chapters, the Prologue? The discrepancy may, of course, be only a seeming one; that is to say, on deeper insight into the general plan of the work it may be found to have been designed. Or again the difficulty may be real, provided we apply our standards of unity of composition to a Hebraic literary production. It is true that there is such a thing as a universal standard against which no poet, be he ever so ancient or "Oriental", may sin with impunity. But it is equally true that within wide limits standards of literary composition have changed with the times. Or the difficulty may be solved by cutting the Gordian knot: a frequent operation of criticism (higher, literary). Thus, according to Duhm, the poem beginning at chapter 3 and concluding with 42, 6 was worked by the post-exilic author into the older framework, the ancient "Volksbuch" of which the first two chapters and the epilogue (42, 7-17) are at present all that remains, the poem having displaced the intermediate part in which Job defended God's justice against the onslaughts of the three friends and which con-

**The Higher
Criticism
again.
Unity of
Authorship**

cluded with a speech of the Lord commending Job. The figure of Satan, which other scholars regard as unmistakable evidence of post-exilic origin¹⁰³, and the late הַאֵל ¹⁰⁴ notwithstanding, the "Volksbuch" is placed by Duhm in pre-deuteronomic times. We may realize from this example how ill-informed we are about the succession of religious ideas that what one regards as late is pronounced by another to be old. The same holds good of linguistic observations; for it is quite true that, though a word or a phrase meets us elsewhere in late writings, it may have commenced to be used at a much earlier period. Suffice it to say that the interpreter's task is not complete until he adjusts the single thought to the general scheme of the work, to its central thought. The whole and the parts—

**The Central
Thought of a
Literary Work**

each receives its full meaning when co-ordinated with the other. It is indeed necessary to know the general purport of a book before we can adequately understand the specific chapters and verses. The method of procedure involves a more or less hasty perusal of the parts and a provisional summing up; then from the point of view of the summary, or the questions concerning the general plan, a more painstaking study of the points of detail as they relate to the plan of the whole. For the supreme question is, What is the content of the entire work and what its object? Some may use the scalpel of criticism too freely; but all of us must seek to penetrate into the innermost thought of the author, the whole thought, the larger meaning. If we proceed in our criticism sanely and with a conservative bias, we shall establish unity of thought by subtle psychologic processes, and show that the unity was original, despite seeming in-

congruities; or if we be chary of harmonistic devices, we shall with the radicals pronounce the unity to be the work of an "editor", and several unities will result; in our case, the unity of the "Volksbuch", and the unity of the poem dovetailed into the framework. From the point of view of criticism, whether we agree with its results or not, a chapter like the first of Genesis assumes a variety of aspects, the sense varying according as we interpret the creation hymn in its early mythical form, then the story as it was told at the Israelitish sanctuaries, then the narrative as it first assumed literary form, and lastly the semi-rationalistic, semi-theological account as we read it now at the opening of the Pentateuch. This, it is true, is vastly more than the ordinary "literary" criticism connotes. Very important is the sense of an omission, of that which with the progress of ideas was cut out, eliminated. The philologist thus would read behind the lines and view Scripture in a chronological perspective with its parts located in superimposed planes. Important, however, as the critical regress to beginning is, the student cannot be too earnestly warned against a sin of omission which is quite frequent in critical works, the forgetting of the converse process of progression towards the form assumed under the hands of the final "redactor". And the very last redactor was the instinct of the Jewish people that made the canon; and it made the canon by exclusion no less than by inclusion.

For in constituting the canon the Jewish people with no mean effort of exegetical skill,—and there is really none higher,—summed up the content of Scriptural thought, of

**Original and
Editorial
Unity**

**The Multiple
Sense of
Scripture on a
Chronological
Basis**

**The Goal of
Biblical
Philology**

the Scriptural *Weltanschauung*, the presentation of which must forever mark the goal of Biblical philology.

21. A question quite pertinent is how far the philologist must identify himself with his subject. If "Nachempfindung"

**Assent to the
Scriptural
Weltanschauung
a Prerequisite
of Exegetical
Success**

be the essence of philology, it would seem impossible without a full measure of identification of interests. Yet this identification may be merely fictitious: we may

for the time being feel with the ancient author and think his thoughts and share his beliefs and hopes, but all this may be a part we play after the fashion of the actor who beneath the assumed personality retains his own¹⁰⁵. Is this dual personality an exegetical possibility? A possibility it is to be sure, but it cannot minister to success. For objectivity is just as much endangered by a hostile as by a friendly attitude. *Tertium non datur*. The impartial mind is, as a rule, the indifferent one, and indifference is a species of hostility. I take it that assent to the Scriptural *Weltanschauung* is a prerequisite of exegetical success in the highest sense of the word¹⁰⁶. And if I may be permitted to express the same thought in different words, only a Jew who knows himself at one with the Biblical religion can adequately interpret the Scriptures. Surely a poet is the poet's best interpreter, and a philosopher the philosopher's. In the same manner it requires a religious mind to understand psalmist and prophet, and only he that is nurtured by Jewish thought, itself rooted in the Scriptures, may hope to master the Scriptural Word in its fullest and deepest import. Only a Jew can say on approaching Holy Writ: This is flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bones. He must possess himself, it is true, of the philological method and of the completest apparatus; but he alone can add thereto that which ensures fullest comprehension: the love

for his own, for the thought that makes his innermost soul to throb, which still lives in him albeit faintly, so that his understanding of the Scriptures, mediated though it be by philological effort, becomes to a considerable extent indeed immediate, just as the language of Scriptures is to him in a large measure a living tongue.

22. A word concerning the art of constructing a commentary and concerning translations. A commentary may either choose to present the entire apparatus, or else give only results. Even in presenting the entire apparatus, it is not necessary to carry the reader into the workshop with all its chaos of open books. A principle of selection will become imperative. It is certainly a weariness of the flesh to wade through bulky commentaries with their interminable parentheses and with all the history of the interpretation of a single verse unrolled in a manner so baffling, so perplexing. Not everything that has been printed is relevant; and this applies to ancients and moderns alike. *Φιλολογία* is not necessarily *πολολογία*. A few representatives judiciously selected will more than balance an army of would-be exegetes and critics. When again a commentary is written for a wider circle, it need not be shallow. It may quite as much represent endless toil which, however, should be wisely kept in the background. It must above all refrain from forcing the passage to be interpreted. An honest statement of the difficulties is worth more than abortive attempts at explanation. We must be ashamed of individual ignorance; but it is our plain duty to share in the general ignorance. Translations are, of course, intended for the widest circles. The translator must guard against the pitfalls of literalism¹⁰⁷ and paraphrase¹⁰⁸ alike. The most perfect translation, of course, is that which imitates

**How to Write
a Commentary
or a Trans-
lation**

all the ambiguities of the original without introducing fresh ones; a truly delicate task. There are obviously cases in which such endeavor would baffle the most expert skill. Translation then becomes an abbreviated commentary; a commentary, moreover, which registers mere results. The translator should therefore resist the temptation of brilliancy at the expense of truth. As a rule, he will acquiesce in the probable rather than risk novelties. There is much in the history of Biblical interpretation that is ephemeral; a translation destined for the people must seek to embody that which is most universally acknowledged; nay, it should be a good deal behind the times. Whereas a translation for the use of the scholar may indulge in all the signs of the critical apparatus and indicate *lacunae* where the translator must, according to strict rules of science, refrain from translating, a popular translation clearly must be consecutive. The Bible, moreover, must be translated as a unit, as it left the hands of the last redactor, as it was gathered into a canon; for surely in a translation one cannot superimpose one stratum upon another. It may be even questionable whether a margin with alternate renderings, or with references to the versions or other "ancient authorities", or with the more literal rendering for the free one in the text, after the fashion of the two historical English Versions, is desirable; for in none of the classes mentioned can there be any attempt at exhaustive treatment. The case, of course, is different when the translation is accompanied by a commentary; then such matter may conveniently be located in the latter. The diction of the translation should accommodate itself to the original; poetry should be rendered in an elevated style, and uncommon Hebrew words by corresponding uncommon English words. In this respect the English Versions are capable of improve-

ment, much as the general style and manner of the Authorized Version must remain forever the starting-point of any new attempt. For, the more we study the English of our Bible, the more we realize the existence of a distinct sacred language which stands quite apart and is still understood in all its niceties by the educated. The sacredness of the original has communicated itself to its versions; the English Bible of 1611 is a classic in English literature quite as much as the original is in Jewish literature.

NOTES

¹ Edited by Bratuscheck, Leipzig, 1877.

² Second edition, Paris, 1907.

³ Whitney, *The Life and Growth of Language*, 1899, 315.

⁴ Compare the title of Mr. Giles' work, "*Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students*" (first edition, 1895); in its German translation it was made to read "*Vergleichende Grammatik der Klassischen Sprachen*" (Leipzig, 1896). Compare also Max Müller, *passim*; Whitney, *l. c.*

⁵ The birth of philology in the modern sense of the word, it has been said, dates from April 8, 1777, when F. A. Wolf registered in the University of Göttingen as *studiosus philologiae*. From 1783 to 1790, Wolf delivered in Halle a series of lectures on the *Encyclopaedia and Methodology of Classical Studies*, the first of which was announced as "*Encyclopaedia philologica, in qua, orbe universo earum rerum, quibus litterae antiquitatis continentur, peragrato, singularum doctrinarum ambitus, argumenta, coniunctiones, utilitates, subsidia, denique recte et cum fructu tractandae cuiusque rationes illustrabuntur*". In an essay printed in the first volume of the "*Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft*" (1807; reprinted in his "*Kleine Schriften*," II, 1869, 808 ff.), he defines "*Alterthumswissenschaft*," i. e. (classical) philology, as the "*Inbegriff der Kenntnisse und Nachrichten, die uns mit den Handlungen und Schicksalen; mit dem politischen, gelehrten und häuslichen Zustande der Griechen und Römer, mit ihrer Cultur, ihren Sprachen, Künsten und Wissenschaften, Sitten, Religionen, National-Charakteren und Denkmälern bekannt machen, dergestalt dass wir geschickt werden die von ihnen auf uns gekommenen Werke gründlich zu verstehen und mit Einsicht in ihren Inhalt und Geist, mit Vergegenwärtigung des alterthümlichen Lebens und Vergleichung des spätern und des heutigen, zu geniessen*". The goal of all such study, "*das letzte Ziel*," is "*kein anderes als die Kenntniss der alterthümlichen Menschheit selbst, welche Kenntniss aus der durch das Studium der alten Ueberreste bedingten Beobachtung einer organisch entwickelten bedeutungsvollen Nationalbildung hervorgeht*". As Prof. Oertel (*Lectures on the Study*

of Language, 1902, 10) aptly remarks, "Wolf conceived of Philology as the Biography of a Nation". The Wolfian definition was somewhat modified by the great philologist Boeckh; to him philology is neither archæology, nor linguistic study, nor criticism, nor history of literature, but its sole task consists in the cognition of that which the human mind has produced. ("das Erkennen des vom menschlichen Geist Producirten"). Boeckh's definition has become the common property of philologists, though here and there it has undergone a slight rephrasing. Thus, in the opening pages of Iwan Müller's "Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft", I, we read: "Die Philologie hat die wissenschaftliche Erkenntnis des fremden Geistes zum Ziel, wie er sich unter bestimmten Verhältnissen einzeln und in Gemeinschaft verkörpert und in bleibenden Denkmälern ausgeprägt hat: sie ist also wesentlich Wiedererkenntnis und Aneignung". Similarly Reinach (*l. c.*, 1): "La philologie embrasse l'étude de toutes les manifestations de l'esprit humain dans l'espace et dans le temps".

⁶ On the subject of gesture-language comp. Darwin, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, 1899, 60 ff.; Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie I = Die Sprache I* (1900), 131 ff.

⁷ So Boeckh (*l. c.*, 11): "Sieht man auf das Wesen der philologischen Thätigkeit selbst, indem man alle willkürlich und empirisch gesetzten Schranken wegnimmt und der Betrachtung die höchste Allgemeinheit giebt, so ist die Philologie—oder, was dasselbe sagt, die Geschichte, *Erkenntnis des Erkannten*".

⁸ "La méthode de recherche de l'histoire, c'est la philologie." "La linguistique, la numismatique, l'archéologie, la critique verbale, l'histoire des arts, des religions, des usages populaires, des faits économiques, des faits politiques, tout cela est tout entier dans l'histoire; donc tout cela est tout entier dans la philologie" (L. Havet in: *Revue politique et littéraire*, 16 Mai 1885, 633 ff.). In history, the same scholar continues, "la méthode ici existe, mais elle se dissimule".

⁹ Comp. Windelband, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft*, Strassburg 1894: "die eine (= Naturforschung) sucht Gesetze, die andere (= Geschichte) Gestalten".

¹⁰ "Kunstgriffe," as Windelband (*l. c.*) expresses himself.

¹¹ "Verstehen schlechthin ist allgemein menschlich, wie sprechen und mittheilen. . . . Von diesem gemeinen Verstehen unterscheidet sich das philologische vor allem durch die künstliche Herbeiführung aller der Bedingungen, unter denen allein das Verständniss möglich ist" (H. Steinthal, *Die Arten und Formen der Interpretation*, in: *Verhandlungen der 32. Philologerversammlung*, 1878, 25 ff.).

¹² "Der Philologe versteht den Redner und Dichter besser als dieser sich selbst und besser als ihn die Zeitgenossen schlechthin verstanden haben: denn er macht klar bewusst, was in jenem nur unmittelbar und thatsächlich vorlag" (Steinthal, *l. c.*, 29).

¹³ ו, (three times), א (three times), ד (twice), ו (four times), ם (once), ל (three times), ה (four times), נ (once), ר (three times), ג (once).

¹⁴ Mesha' and Siloam inscriptions, coins, Phœnician, Samaritan.

¹⁵ Hence the finals ן ף ף ם ן ן.

¹⁶ Acrostics in the Psalms and elsewhere; also in Nahum 1?

¹⁷ Talmud, Septuagint. Hence the Greek names *Alpha*, *Beta*, etc.

¹⁸ ספר יצירה.

¹⁹ Above and below the line: ׀ (four times), = (three times), ׀ (once), ׀ (five times), ׀ (twice), ׀ (twice).

²⁰ Jerome and the Talmud know of no points.

²¹ Superlinear, Babylonian, נקוד אשורי.

²² The Tiberian ׀ *segol* and its Babylonian counterpart.

²³ Gemination, compensation; explosive sound, the opposite whereof—the spirant—is sometimes marked by a horizontal stroke above the letter: ׀.

²⁴ ד, ד, א, א, א, א, א, א with their Babylonian counterparts.

²⁵ Word and sentence-accent.

²⁶ Syllabication: open or closed syllable, accented or unaccented.

²⁷ A knowledge of syntax is a prerequisite. The same holds good of the metrical systems which should be discussed in an appendix.

²⁸ At first used sparsely; particularly frequent in late writings.

²⁹ Loss of sound, quiescence.

³⁰ Pre-Hebrew, Semitic.

³¹ Division of words.

³² Comp. Hayyūj on the pronunciation of ׀ and Ben Asher's minute directions concerning the ׀. See the writer's "The Pronunciation of the שוא according to New Hexaplaric Material", *AJSL.*, XXVI (1909), 62 ff.

³³ Jerome, Hexapla, Septuagint.

³⁴ Sephardic, Ashkenazic.

³⁵ Vulgo: imperfect. See n. 55.

³⁶ Implied in the geminated ׀; compare the phonology.

³⁷ Primitively ׀, comp. the noun ׀; see the phonology.

³⁸ Pausal for ׀, comp. Aramaic גברא.

³⁹ *fa'l*; an advance on the mediæval grammarians; aid from the cognate languages, with which is to be compared the Hexaplaric transliteration of *segolates*.

⁴⁰ *Nomen actionis*, *nomen agentis*, etc.

⁴¹ Convergence of forms through phonetic modification (improper *fa'l* nouns originating in *fa'il*, for example), semantic development which leads to concrete out of abstract nouns and the like.

⁴² The formal side in the morphology, the functional in the following part.

⁴³ When they agree with our text and are not guessing.

⁴⁴ The canon artificially marks the boundary line; there is Mishnic Hebrew in the canon and Biblical Hebrew outside the canon, compare Bar Sira, but

also Mishna and Baraita sporadically. Care must be had, however, lest the Mishnic use is itself derived from the Biblical phrase.

⁴⁵ E. g., the names of precious stones, zoological and botanical names, or the catalogue of articles of finery in the third chapter of Isaiah on which a theologian has written a work consisting of three volumes.

⁴⁶ Recourse was had to certain persons (the maidservant in the house of Rabbi) with whom Hebrew was still a living language; or to a Bedouin.

⁴⁷ Witness the disagreement. Very often they probably acquiesced in a *quid pro quo* or an approximate rendering after the manner of the Authorized Version; compare, for example, the word *gourd*.

⁴⁸ So Ibn Koreish.

⁴⁹ Principally Ibn Janah.

⁵⁰ Jerome found Latin words in the Scriptures.

⁵¹ But not necessarily so in primitive stages: the feminine suffix *-a* in the Indo-European languages is said to have come about in imitation of the word for *wife, woman*, whose root happened to end in *-a*; see Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II 1 (1899), 100 f.

⁵² So the case-endings which primitive Hebrew possessed are absent in historical Hebrew; the same has happened, for instance, also in English.

⁵³ At any rate conventionally; properly it should form a grammatical division by itself, and the syntax should be made to begin with the combination of sentences into a period.

⁵⁴ Nominal and verbal clauses; asseverative, negative, interrogative, etc.

⁵⁵ *Pre—*, after the manner of Sweet, is with me an abbreviation for: the form of the verb made with formative *prefixes*. König calls it the *Yaktul* form. The ordinary name "imperfect" labels it after one of its functions, and moreover has no place in the morphology where forms should be classified as forms, and not according to their function.

⁵⁶ אֲזַ יִשִּׁיר, טָרָם יִהְיֶה .

⁵⁷ The Assyrian so-called preterite (*ikšad, ikšud*) is identical in form with the Hebrew imperfect (יִמְלֹךְ for instance). Apparently in the primitive Semitic language the pre-form was indifferent as to the time; in the historical languages it was, therefore, free to develop into a preterite (as in Assyrian) or into a subjunctive (as in Ethiopic). Hebrew itself leads to the same conclusion. Simple preterital traces have been preserved in אֲזַ יִקְהֵל which is in no wise different from אֲזַ יִקְהֵל ; that is to say, the aoristic force does not lie in the verbal form, but in the accompanying adverb of time אֲזַ and its equivalent אֲזַ . The Greek aorist itself, we are told, originated in the same manner. The preterital force belongs to the augment (ἐξ) which originally was an adverb of time, = *then*, to which the verbal form was joined enclitically. With augmentless forms the temporal force likewise came from the context and was not inherent in the verbal form (see Brugmann,

l. c., II 2 (1892), 859 f., 866 ff.; *Griechische Grammatik*, 3d ed., 1900, 262-267. Even the accentual conditions of the Greek compound which we call aorist seem to have prevailed in primitive Hebrew: *wa yaḥhil* (hence the loss of the final vowel and the shortening of the stem-vowel in the ensuing closed syllable; hence in the case of an open penult, the accent rests there even in historical times: *wa-yyā'kem*. See the writer's "Notes on Semitic Grammar III", *AJSL.*, XIX (1902), 46, n. 4.

⁵⁸ Comp. *והלילה אמר* in the second half of the verse.

⁵⁹ See Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, 451, n. 1.

⁶⁰ Comp. Menahem Ibn Sarūk. s. v. *זר*; Ibn Ezra and Rashi, *passim*.

⁶¹ This complement may be omitted in prose, and certainly in poetry.

⁶² *Niddah* 16 b.

⁶³ See Cornill, *Ezechiel*, 123. But also in the other versions; comp. the writer's "Character of the Anonymous Greek Version of Habakkuk, chapter 3" in: *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper*, I (1908), 135 f.

⁶⁴ Material may be found in the works of Malbim and Ehrlich; to be used with caution.

⁶⁵ *פשטות מתחדשים בכל-יום*. Comp. Rashbam, ed. Rosin, 1881, 49 (on Gen. 37, 2).

⁶⁶ As if *אמר* could be construed over *הרה* with *גבר* and as if *אמר גבר* were tantamount to *אמר לגבר*!

⁶⁷ "Man sollte dem Dichter, trotz seiner unleugbaren Neigung für das Überladene, nicht den Verstoß gegen das einfachste ästhetische Empfinden zuschreiben, zwei so ganz verschiedene Objekte mit einander zu verbinden."

⁶⁸ *עבר אבי את-אמי*.

⁶⁹ The meaning: *point* may itself be secondary, derived from the primary signification: *throw, shoot*, in which sense we find both the simple stem and the causative (I Sam. 20, 36). Of course, we are treading on unsafe ground; the etymology of *תורה* is involved, about which there have been many guesses (Assyrian *ārū* "lead, guide", and *tērtu* "law" is compared by some scholars). But *ירה*, *הורה* apparently has also the meaning: *throw water, rain*; hence *מורה* the *early rain*, = *יורה* which is a nominal form of the type *yaf'al*. Others again distinguish three different roots *ירה*: (1) *throw*, comp. Ethiopic *warawa*, modern Arabic *warra*; (2) causative = *moisten*, a by-form of *רוה*, comp. for the transposition *יען* and *עון* for example; (3) causative = *teach*. From the sense *moisten* we would obtain: *fructify*.

⁷⁰ With the *ר* properly geminated, compensative production.

⁷¹ It has been said that "there is no manuscript so old as common sense".

⁷² Autograph or immediate transcript, sometimes prepared by an amanuensis at dictation, compare Baruch and Jeremiah.

⁷³ Compare the *תקוני סופרים* for example.

⁷⁴ Scribal errors, graphic or auricular; change of script from the Old Hebrew to the square; dittography; haplography; aberration of the eye to a line above or below; lacunae; illegibility of the "Vorlage"; etc.

⁷⁵ E. g. Chronicles compared with the sources (Pentateuch, Samuel, Kings); deuterographs; הנסח השני, as Ibn Janah expresses himself.

⁷⁶ J. Reach, *Die Sebirin der Massoreten von Tiberias*, 1895.

⁷⁷ Ellipsis, pleonasm, etc.

⁷⁸ Marginal (*masora parva*, *masora magna*) or systematic (*masora finalis*, *אכלה ואכלה*).

⁷⁹ 'Aruk, Rashi and others. Thus, for example, Pesahim 113 *a* the editions and the two Munich MSS. read פשוט, whereas 'Aruk has נשוט (comp. Syriac) which reading is also found in the Columbia College MS. described by the writer in his "The Columbia College MS. of Meghilla", 1892, 1.

⁸⁰ Gaonic Responsa; so Sanhedrin 106 *a* we find in the *Tešubot ha-ge-onim*, ed. Harkavy, the reading אינאן which is explicitly interpreted as a Persian feminine proper name for אִינָא (י) of the editions and the Munich (cod. 95) and Karlsruhe MSS., an impossible grammatical form.

⁸¹ The comparatively small number of variants in the Pentateuch, for example, need not be taken as a proof of originality.

⁸² Rabbinovicz; but see the writer's remarks in *TLZ.*, 1908, 610 f., and in the Preface to his *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud*, 1910.

⁸³ See the writer's "Commentarius Isaacidis, etc.", 1891, 1 ff.

⁸⁴ The efforts of Baer and Ginsburg (not to mention their predecessors) notwithstanding.

⁸⁵ Comp. Norzi, *passim*.

⁸⁶ See on Zechar. 14, 5.

⁸⁷ See a series of articles by the writer in *ZAW.*, XXV (1905), 311-319; XXVI (1906), 85-89; XXVII (1907), 212-270; *AJSL.*, XXII (1906), 110-119; XXV (1909), 33-61.

⁸⁸ *Male child* as in Hebrew בֶּן זָכָר Jerem. 20, 15.

⁸⁹ The reference to the conception; גִּבֶּר *vir adultus*.

⁹⁰ Comp. the Concordance.

⁹¹ א = Masoretic note; Heb. = the Hebrew text in adequate translation; Σ = Symmachus; S = Syriac Version; V = Vulgate; T = Targum; G = Septuagint.

⁹² "Man findet gewöhnlich in Hi 3 ff., eine grössere poetische Kraft als in Jer 20, 14 ff.; auf mich machen die schmuckloseren, naiveren Schmerzensausbrüche Jeremias einen ergreifenderen Eindruck, als die kunstvollere Nachahmung, die überlegter, aber etwas überladen und kalt ist."

⁹³ Duhm's rendering.

⁹⁴ See Steinthal, *l. c.*, 31 f.

⁹⁵ For instance, *the Holy One of Israel*.

⁹⁶ Hagigah 13 b.

⁹⁷ Sanhedrin 89 a.

⁹⁸ וי' לההוא בר נש דאמר דהא אוריתא אתא לאחזאה סיפורין בעלמא ומלין
דהיומי (Zohar on Num. 9, 1).

⁹⁹ אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו (Shabbat 63 a).

¹⁰⁰ Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph., c. 14: *ὕμεις πάντα σαρκικῶς νενοήκατε.*

¹⁰¹ Origen, De principiis, liber iv: *ψιλὸν γράμμα.*

¹⁰² Jerome, Epist. 64, c. 9: "*antequam mysticam scruter intelligentiam, more Iudaico quae scripta sunt simpliciter exponam.*"

¹⁰³ It occurs for the first time in Zechariah!

¹⁰⁴ 2, 10, 10; elsewhere Prov. 19, 20; Ezra 8, 30; Esther 4, 4; 9, 23, 27; I Chron. 12, 19; II Chron. 29, 16, 22; comp. Abot 1, 1 and elsewhere frequently.

¹⁰⁵ Littré has said somewhere: "Il faut que le coeur devienne ancien parmi les anciennes choses, et la plénitude de l'histoire ne se dévoile qu'à celui qui descend, ainsi disposé, dans le passé. Mais il faut que l'esprit demeure moderne, et n'oublie jamais qu'il n'y a pour lui d'autre foi que la foi scientifique."

¹⁰⁶ Comp. Luzzatto's Introduction to his Commentary on Isaiah.

¹⁰⁷ After the manner of Aquila.

¹⁰⁸ In the style of the Targum.